



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

**FISCAL YEAR 2005
CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM
OPERATIONAL MEMO #43**

TO: Child and Adult Care Food Program Institutions

FROM: Mary Ann Chartrand, Director
Grants Coordination and School Support

DATE: September 29, 2005

SUBJECT: **Providing Information versus Writing Bid Specifications and Contract Terms**

Pursuant to Section 12(o) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, 42 USC 1760(o), a school district and/or child care institution may "enter into a contract with a person that has provided specification information to the (. . . school district and/or child care institution. . .) for use in developing contract specifications for acquiring such goods or service."

It is important to remember that the school district and/or child care institution, not the potential contractor, is responsible for complying with statutory and regulatory provisions. If a school district and/or child care institution awards a contract to a potential contractor that has written the specifications used in the school district and/or child care institution's solicitation, the school district and/or child care institution, not the potential contractor, has violated §3016.60(b). The same holds true when a school district and/or child care institution incorporates into its contract the terms and conditions written by the contractor.

For your reference, attached are questions and answers that address the application of §3016.60(b) in varying situations.

If you have any questions, call the CACFP office at (517) 373-7391.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

Question 1: Do the Part 3016.60(b) provisions (a contract cannot be awarded to a potential contractor that has drafted the bid/proposal specifications) apply to the potential contractor or the school district?

Answer: The requirements of 3016.60(b) apply to the school district, not the potential contractor. The responsibility for complying with program requirements, including the Department's regulations, is conveyed through the state agency-school district agreement.

Question 2: Does §3016.60(b) prohibit school districts from attending manufacturer and dealer shows?

Answer: Part 3016.60(b) does not limit the sources from which a school district may obtain information. As explained in the August 20, 2000 Federal Register (Vol. 65, No. 157, pages 49477), program operators can obtain information from a variety of sources. These sources can include obtaining information by attending shows held by specific manufacturers, dealers, and distributors that exclusively market only one manufacturer's products.

Question 3: What is the difference between a potential contractor providing information versus drafting specifications, since the information provided by the potential contractor could be equal to a specification?

Answer: In the broadest terms, providing information can range from simple statements about a product to a technical and detailed description that is equivalent to a specification for that product. School districts may obtain information that is equivalent to a written specification and still award the contract to the potential contractor providing that information, as long as the school district develops its own specifications.

Question 4: If the SFA makes minor changes to the specifications provided by a potential contractor, can the SFA award the contract to that potential contractor?

Answer: As stated in the answer to question 3, the school district alone is responsible for developing the specifications that are actually used in its solicitation. The intent of §3016.60(b) is to prevent one potential contractor from obtaining an unfair competitive advantage over other potential contractors. While a minor change to specifications drafted by a potential contractor is generally not going to eliminate this unfair competitive advantage, each case must be reviewed individually. For example, a potential contractor writes the product specifications including a label description that is unique to the potential contractor's product. Except for this label description, the product would be available from a number of other competing suppliers.

The school district, when developing its own specifications, retains all of the specification information but eliminates the restrictive labeling requirement. While this change appears minor on its face, it has opened the procurement to a number of competing potential suppliers.

Question 5: A manufacturer that directly sells its products to customers also uses distributors and dealers. If the manufacturer agrees not to bid on the procurement but writes the bid specifications, can the school district still purchase the manufacturer's product from another distributor or dealer?

Answer: If the only product that can meet the bid specifications is the manufacturer's product, then the self-exclusion of the manufacturer from the bidding process is a transparent attempt to circumvent the intent of 3016.60(b).

Question 6: Is the answer to Question 5 different when the manufacturer does not sell its products to customers? Instead, it offers its products through dealers and distributors. Some of these dealers and distributors are exclusive, i.e., selling only that manufacturer's products, while others are not. Can the school district still purchase that particular product if the school district restricts its pool of eligible bidders by excluding the manufacturer's exclusive distributors and dealers?

Answer: No. If the only product that can meet the school district's bid specifications is the manufacturer's product, then excluding manufacturer-specific dealers and distributors from the pool of eligible suppliers would not eliminate the unfair competitive advantage gained by the manufacturer writing the bid specifications.

Question 7: In most requests for proposals, some parts of the contract will not be written until after the negotiation phase has been completed. Usually one party will agree to draft the contract terms representing the results of the negotiations. Can the school district allow a Food Service Management Company (FSMC) to draft these negotiation results and still enter into a contract with that FSMC?

Answer: To prevent any potential violation of §3016.60(b), the school district should draft the contract terms representing the results of a negotiation. Generally, there should be no violation of §3016.60(b) when the school district directs the FSMC to prepare a written summary of the negotiations and the school district uses this summary as one source of information to draft the contract terms representing the results of the negotiations.

Question 8: Does §3016.60(b) apply only to formal (exceeding the small purchase threshold) procurements or to all purchases?

Answer: The provisions of §3016.60(b) apply to any acquisition of goods or services using written specifications. School districts and other public child nutrition program operators must follow their own applicable state and local procurement requirements. Some of these state and local requirements do impose written specification requirements for acquisitions that are at or below the applicable small purchase threshold. If written specifications are used for these small purchase acquisitions, §3016.60(b) would apply. The small purchase threshold that school districts must adhere to, unless the school districts have established a more stringent threshold level than the state, for school year 2005-06 is \$18,915.

Question 9: Is there a corresponding requirement to §3016.60(b) for child care institutions?

Answer: Yes. All nonprofit child nutrition program operators (school districts, Child and Adult Care Food Program institutions, and Summer Food Service Program sponsors) have been prohibited from awarding contracts to potential contractors that drafted procurement documents since the mid-1970s. That prohibition is stated at §3019.43.

Question 10: A number of State agencies are requiring that solicitations and the resulting cost reimbursable contracts require the return of all discounts and rebates earned on contractor billed purchases. Has Food Nutrition Service (FNS) changed its position on these discounts and rebates?

Answer: No. FNS' position on this subject remains unchanged from its May 20, 2003, memorandum, Applicability of Federal Requirements to School Food Service Procurements. As stated in that memorandum, "FNS strongly encourages, but does not require, that all cost reimbursable contracts include provisions to ensure SFAs are only charged net, allowable costs. The Office of Management and Budget and the Department's Office of the General Counsel have made clear that State agencies and SFAs can impose compliance with net cost requirements through contractual terms."